

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/718,614	11/24/2003	Stephen R. Glaser	GLA-101-CON	1603
24395 WILMER CUT	1395 7590 02/12/2007 VILMER CUTLER PICKERING HALE AND DORR LLP		EXAMINER	
1875 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., NW			MANUEL, GEORGE C	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 20004		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3762	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
		•	02/12/2007	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

teresa.carvalho@wilmerhale.com tina.dougal@wilmerhale.com michael.mathewson@wilmerhale.com

		<i>M</i> ^			
	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Advisory Action	10/718,614	GLASER, STEPHEN R.			
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit			
	George Manuel	3762			
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
THE REPLY FILED 07 November 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.					
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:					
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing		in the final rejection, which ever is letter. In			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.					
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).					
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL					
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).					
AMENDMENTS					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below); (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);					
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims. NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).					
 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s) 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all 		timely filed amendment canceling the			
non-allowable claim(s).		· ·			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed:					
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:					
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE					
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).					
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).					
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER					
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>					
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) 13. Other:					
		a cul			
		George Manuel			
		Primary Examiner Art Unit: 3762			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 08-06) Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant appears to be showing nonobviousness by attacking the references individually while the rejections are based on combinations of references. In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., Inc., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). For example, contrast sensitivity or spatial frequency perception do not preclude requesting a patient to find matching optotypes.